

Appendix 1
**Land Residual
and Subsidy Analysis**



In order to test the economic feasibility of the proposed development prototypes in both the Village Center and along the existing commercial corridors an analysis was conducted to determine the land residual values (improved land values) associated with the development prototypes. The analysis also includes the resulting development and land subsidies required from the City of Long Beach to motivate a developer to implement the development prototypes.

All of the development subsidies presented are estimates and are for purposes of comparing development costs between sites and alternatives. Actual development costs and land acquisition costs will differ from location to location and will be based on the magnitude of proposed projects. Revenue, cost, and land acquisition assumptions were based on the following:

Revenue Inputs

Revenue assumptions (i.e., sale price, rental rates) were based on current pricing information for existing developments, obtained through interviews with developers and property managers.

Cost Inputs

Cost inputs were based on discussions with developers and consultant assumptions. To avoid understating costs, a 'place holder' was used where site-specific information was not available (i.e., site costs).

Acquisition Cost of Land

Based on discussions with the City of Long Beach, a land acquisition cost of \$25 per square foot of land is assumed for all sites. The City acknowledges that sites located along major corridors, particularly sites for the Village Center concepts, may have higher land acquisition costs, starting at \$25 per square foot, and even approaching up to \$40 to \$50 per square foot.



Village Center Concepts

The table on this page summarizes the subsidies required for Alternative (Phase) A and three concepts for Alternative (Phase) B of the Village Center. These totals are less the cost of implementing a building rehabilitation program for several existing commercial buildings on two sites comprising a total of approximately 2.3 acres.

Alternative A is a less intensive development concept, consisting of single-story retail, surface parking, and a rehabilitation program. In terms of development costs and required subsidy, each of the retail structures proposed would require approximately \$623,000 in subsidy (for 22,400 square feet of commercial development on a half acre lot with 36 at grade parking spaces). Parking lots would require approximately \$516,000 in subsidy (for 40 spaces on one third of an acre). Total development subsidy for this Alternative is approximately \$2.2 million. This cost does not include streetscape or other improvements detailed in the North Long Beach Public Works Master Plan.

Alternative B utilizes a higher density development as well as a public/civic use, such as a library, as catalysts within the area, in addition to the retail and surface parking components. Option A and B explore the use of a higher density, mixed-use development (48 rental units on two floors over 35,000 square feet of groundfloor retail), with different parking solutions. Option A assumes a subterranean parking treatment, while Option B includes surface parking as well as the acquisition of about half an acre to develop additional surface parking spaces to meet the mixed-use project's parking requirements. Option C eliminates the residential use and consists only of a single-story, 35,000-square foot retail building. Total subsidy requirements for all three concepts under Alternative B do not include the development of the civic/public use (potential library site).

The significant retail-only structure proposed (under Option C) would require a development subsidy of approximately \$2.5 million (for 35,000 square feet of commercial development on 2.3 acres with 51 at grade parking spaces). Total development subsidy (the primary retail structure plus other recommendations) for this Phase is approximately \$3.5 million. This cost does not include the development of the public facility (library), or streetscape and other improvements detailed in the North Long Beach Public Works Master Plan.

The development of a mixed-use building (as opposed to a retail-only development) would require a development subsidy of approximately \$5 million for 35,000 square feet of commercial development, 57,600 square feet/30-40 residential units on 2.3 acres with 230 structured parking spaces.

Summary of Required Subsidies

Village Center, Alternatives (Phases) A and B

	ALTERNATIVE (PHASE) A	ALTERNATIVE (PHASE) B		
		<u>Option A</u>	<u>Option B</u>	<u>Option C</u>
Total Required Subsidy	\$2.2 MM	\$6.0 MM	\$5.8 MM	\$3.5 MM



SUMMARY SPREADSHEETS

Village Center Concepts



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

SUMMARY I -- VILLAGE CENTER, ALTERNATIVES A AND B
SUMMARY OF PRODUCT PROTOTYPES AND SUBSIDY REQUIREMENT
NORTH LONG BEACH
APRIL 2001

ALTERNATIVE A

SITE PRODUCT	AREA 1 SINGLE STORY RETAIL AT GRADE PARKING
-----------------	---------------------------------------------------

Land Area	0.51
Acres	22,400
SF	--
Du/Acre	--
Total Units	9,000
Total Retail SF	36
Total Parking Spaces	At Grade
Parking Type	
Required Subsidy	
Site Acquisition	\$560,000
Development Subsidy	\$63,000
Total Required Subsidy	\$623,000
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land	\$28

ALTERNATIVE B

SITE PRODUCT	OPTION 1		OPTION 2		OPTION 3	
	AREA 1 MIXED-USE MF RENTAL SUBTERRANEAN PARKING	AREA 1 MIXED-USE MF RENTAL AT GRADE PARKING	AREA 2 SURFACE PARKING LOT	AREA 2 SURFACE PARKING LOT	AREA 3 SINGLE STORY RETAIL AT GRADE PARKING	AREA 3 SINGLE STORY RETAIL AT GRADE PARKING

Land Area	2.29	2.29	0.42	0.42	2.29	2.29
Acres	99,560	99,560	18,360	18,360	99,560	99,560
SF	21	21	--	--	--	--
Du/Acre	48	48	--	--	--	--
Total Units	35,000	35,000	--	--	35,000	35,000
Total Retail SF	230	179	51	51	51	51
Total Parking Spaces	Subterranean	At Grade	At Grade	At Grade	At Grade	At Grade
Parking Type						
Required Subsidy						
Site Acquisition	\$2,489,000	\$2,489,000	\$459,000	\$459,000	\$2,489,000	\$2,489,000
Development Subsidy	\$2,526,000	\$1,633,000	\$187,000	\$187,000	\$0	\$0
Total Required Subsidy	\$5,015,000	\$4,122,000	\$646,000	\$646,000	\$2,489,000	\$2,489,000
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land	\$50	\$41	\$35	\$35	\$25	\$25

SOURCE: EIP Associates; Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

SUMMARY I -- VILLAGE CENTER, ALTERNATIVES A AND B
SUMMARY OF PRODUCT PROTOTYPES AND SUBSIDY REQUIREMENT
NORTH LONG BEACH
APRIL 2001

ALTERNATIVE A

SITE PRODUCT	AREA 2 REHABILITATION PROGRAM	AREA 3 SURFACE PARKING LOT	AREA 4 SINGLE STORY RETAIL AT GRADE PARKING	AREA 5 REHABILITATION PROGRAM	AREA SURI PARKIN
Land Area	1.27	0.38	0.40	1.05	0.
Acres	55,300	16,500	17,500	45,700	14.
SF	--	--	--	--	--
Du/Acre	--	--	--	--	--
Total Units	--	--	7,100	--	--
Total Retail SF	--	--	28	--	4
Total Parking Spaces	--	46	At Grade	--	At G
Parking Type	--	At Grade	--	--	--
Required Subsidy	--	--	--	--	--
Site Acquisition	--	\$413,000	\$438,000	--	\$36;
Development Subsidy	--	\$170,000	\$47,000	--	\$15;
Total Required Subsidy	--	\$583,000	\$484,000	--	\$515
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land	--	\$35	\$28	--	\$;

ALTERNATIVE B

SITE PRODUCT	AREA 3 REHABILITATION PROGRAM	AREA 4 SURFACE PARKING LOT	AREA 5 PUBLIC USE	AREA 6 SINGLE STORY RETAIL AT GRADE PARKING	AREA 7 REHABILITATION PROGRAM
Land Area	1.27	0.38	1.38	0.40	1.05
Acres	55,300	16,500	60,000	17,500	45,700
SF	--	--	--	--	--
Du/Acre	--	--	--	--	--
Total Units	--	--	--	7,100	--
Total Retail SF	--	--	--	28	--
Total Parking Spaces	--	46	--	At Grade	--
Parking Type	--	At Grade	--	--	--
Required Subsidy	--	--	--	--	--
Site Acquisition	--	\$413,000	--	\$438,000	--
Development Subsidy	--	\$170,000	--	\$47,000	--
Total Required Subsidy	--	\$583,000	--	\$484,000	--
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land	--	\$35	--	\$28	--

SOURCE: EIP Associates; Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lessor & Co.



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit I-1 / Summary of Land Residual Values for Target Sites
VILLAGE CENTER -- ALTERNATIVE A / March 2001

SITE	IA-1 AREA 1	IA-2 AREA 3	IA-3 AREA 4	IA-4 AREA 6
PRODUCT	SINGLE STORY RETAIL	SURFACE	SINGLE STORY RETAIL	SURFACE
PARKING	AT GRADE PARKING	PARKING LOT	AT GRADE PARKING	PARKING LOT
Land Area				
Acres	0.51	0.38	0.40	0.33
SF	22,400	16,500	17,500	14,500
Dw/Acre	--	--	--	--
Total SF	21,960	16,500	17,324	14,500
Retail				
Total SF	9,000	--	7,100	--
Monthly Rent/SF (NNIN)	\$1.25	--	\$1.25	--
Operating Expenses/SF	\$0.25	--	\$0.25	--
Hard Costs/SF	\$75	--	\$75	--
Hard Costs/SF (Union) 1/	\$90	--	\$90	--
Total Hard Costs (Union) 1/	\$810,000	--	\$639,000	--
Parking				
Parking Space/Bedroom 2/	--	--	--	--
Parking Space/1,000 SF Retail	4	--	4	--
Total Parking Spaces	36	46	28	40
Total Parking SF 2/	12,960	16,500	10,224	14,500
Parking Type	At Grade	At Grade	At Grade	At Grade
Total Parking Spaces	36	46	28	40
Hard Costs/SF	\$6	\$6	\$6	\$6
Hard Costs/SF (Union) 1/	\$7	\$7	\$7	\$7
Hard Costs/Space (Union) 1/	\$2,592	\$2,592	\$2,592	\$2,592
Parking Type	--	--	--	--
Total Parking Spaces	--	--	--	--
Hard Costs/SF	--	--	--	--
Hard Costs/SF (Union) 1/	--	--	--	--
Hard Costs/Space (Union) 1/	--	--	--	--
Total Hard Costs (Union) 1/	\$93,312	\$118,800	\$73,613	\$104,400
Improved Land Value	-\$63,067	-\$170,437	-\$48,094	-\$152,978
Per Acre	-\$122,644	-\$449,953	-\$119,713	-\$459,568
Per Unit	--	--	--	--
Per SF	-\$3	-\$10	-\$3	-\$11
Required Subsidy				
Site Acquisition	\$560,000	\$412,500	\$437,500	\$362,500
Development Subsidy	\$63,067	\$170,437	\$48,094	\$152,978
Total Required Subsidy	\$623,067	\$582,937	\$485,594	\$515,478
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land	\$28	\$35	\$28	\$36

1/ Union costs assume 20% mark-up of direct construction costs.

2/ Assumes 360 SF per parking space.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-1A-1 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
AREA I SINGLE STORY RETAIL AT GRADE PARKING

ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	RETAIL		PARKING	
		TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PER SF
Total Buildable Acres	0.51				
Land Area in SF	22,400				
F.A.R.					
Total SF (Net)	21,960	9,000		12,960	36
REVENUES					
Average Monthly Rent	\$11,250	\$11,250	\$1.25		
Annual Scheduled Rent	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$15.00		
Vacancy Allowance	5.0%	-\$6,750			
Total Rent Collected	\$128,250	\$128,250			
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0	\$0			
Effective Gross Income	\$128,250	\$128,250			
Operating Expenses 1/	\$2,250	\$2,250	\$0.25/SF		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)	\$126,000	\$126,000			
CAPITALIZATION RATE	9.50%				
CAPITALIZED VALUE	\$1,326,316	\$1,326,316			
HARD COSTS					
Construction Costs	\$903,312	\$810,000	\$90/SF	\$93,312	\$7/SF
Sitework	\$50,000				
Landscaping	\$14,000				
TOTAL HARD COSTS	\$967,312				
SOFT COSTS					
Permits and Fees 2/	\$69,624				
Architecture & Engineering	\$58,000				
Marketing	\$19,900				
Cost of Sale	\$39,789				
General Administrative	\$39,800				
Financing Costs	\$13,926				
Builder Profit	\$132,632				
Contingency	\$46,400				
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	\$422,071				
TOTAL COSTS	\$1,389,383				
Improved Land Value	-\$63,067				
Per Acre	-\$122,644				
Per Land SF	-\$2.82				

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach; Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-1A-2 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS

AREA 3 SURFACE PARKING LOT

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	PARKING	
			TOTAL	PER SF
Total Buildable Acres		0.38		
Land Area in SF		16,500		
Total SF (Net)		16,500	16,500	46
REVENUES				
Average Monthly Rent		\$0		
Annual Scheduled Rent		\$0		
Vacancy Allowance	0.0%	\$0		
Total Rent Collected		\$0		
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0	\$0		
Effective Gross Income		\$0		
Operating Expenses 1/		\$0		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)		\$0		
CAPITALIZATION RATE	9.50%			
CAPITALIZED VALUE		\$0		
HARD COSTS				
Construction Costs		\$118,800	\$118,800	\$7/SF
Sitework	5% % of Hard Costs	\$6,300		
Landscaping	1% % of Total Costs	\$1,700		
TOTAL HARD COSTS	74.4% % of Total Costs	\$126,800		
SOFT COSTS				
Permits and Fees 2/	2.9% % of Total Costs	\$4,964		
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$7,600		
Marketing	0.0% % of Total Costs	\$0		
Cost of Sale	3.0% % of Total Costs	\$4,350		
General Administrative	3.0% % of Total Costs	\$4,400		
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Total Costs	\$1,523		
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Total Costs	\$14,500		
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$6,300		
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	25.6% % of Total Costs	\$43,637		
TOTAL COSTS		\$170,437		
Improved Land Value		-\$170,437		
Per Acre		-\$449,953		
Per Land SF		-\$10.33		

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach; Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-IA-3 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
AREA 4 SINGLE STORY RETAIL AT GRADE PARKING

ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT		RETAIL		PARKING	
		PER SF	TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PER SPACE
Total Buildable Acres	0.40					
Land Area in SF	17,500					
F.A.R.						
Total SF (Net)	17,324		7,100		10,224	28
REVENUES						
Average Monthly Rent	\$8,875	\$1.25	\$8,875			
Annual Scheduled Rent	\$106,500	\$15.00	\$106,500			
Vacancy Allowance	5.0%		-\$5,325			
Total Rent Collected	\$101,175		\$101,175			
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0		\$0			
Effective Gross Income	\$101,175		\$101,175			
Operating Expenses 1/	\$1,775	\$0.25/SF	\$1,775			
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)	\$99,400		\$99,400			
CAPITALIZATION RATE	9.50%					
CAPITALIZED VALUE			\$1,046,316			
HARD COSTS						
Construction Costs			\$712,613	\$90/SF	\$73,613	\$7/SF
Sitework	5% % of Hard Costs		\$38,000			
Landscaping	1% % of Total Costs		\$11,000			
TOTAL HARD COSTS	69.6% % of Total Costs		\$761,613			
SOFT COSTS						
Permits and Fees 2/	5.0% % of Total Costs		\$54,890			
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs		\$45,700			
Marketing	1.5% % of Capitalized Value		\$15,700			
Cost of Sale	3.0% % of Capitalized Value		\$31,389			
General Administrative	3.0% % of Capitalized Value		\$31,400			
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Capitalized Value		\$10,986			
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Capitalized Value		\$104,632			
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs		\$38,100			
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	30.4% % of Total Costs		\$332,797			
TOTAL COSTS			\$1,094,410			
Improved Land Value			-\$48,094			
Per Acre			-\$119,713			
Per Land SF			-\$2.75			

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-1A-4 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS

AREA 6 SURFACE PARKING LOT

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	PARKING	
			TOTAL	PER SF
Total Buildable Acres		0.33		
Land Area in SF		14,500		
Total SF (Net)		14,500	14,500	40
REVENUES				
Average Monthly Rent		\$0		
Annual Scheduled Rent		\$0		
Vacancy Allowance	0.0%	\$0		
Total Rent Collected		\$0		
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0	\$0		
Effective Gross Income		\$0		
Operating Expenses 1/		\$0		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)		\$0		
CAPITALIZATION RATE	9.50%			
CAPITALIZED VALUE		\$0		
HARD COSTS				
Construction Costs		\$104,400	\$104,400	\$7/SF
Sitework	5% % of Hard Costs	\$5,550		
Landscaping	1% % of Total Costs	\$1,500		
TOTAL HARD COSTS	72.9% % of Total Costs	\$111,450		
SOFT COSTS				
Permits and Fees 2/	2.9% % of Total Costs	\$4,456		
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$6,700		
Marketing	0.0% % of Total Costs	\$0		
Cost of Sale	3.0% % of Total Costs	\$4,350		
General Administrative	3.0% % of Total Costs	\$4,400		
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Total Costs	\$1,523		
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Total Costs	\$14,500		
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$5,600		
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	27.1% % of Total Costs	\$41,528		
TOTAL COSTS		\$152,978		
Improved Land Value		-\$152,978		
Per Acre		-\$459,568		
Per Land SF		-\$10.55		

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegal Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit I-2 / Summary Of Land Residual Values For Target Sites
VILLAGE CENTER -- ALTERNATIVE B / March 2001

SITE PRODUCT PARKING	IB-1 OPTION 1		IB-2 OPTION 2		IB-3 OPTION 3		IB-4 OPTION 4		IB-5 OPTION 5		IB-6 OPTION 6	
	AREA 1		AREA 2		AREA 3		AREA 4		AREA 5		AREA 6	
	MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL	SUBTERRANEAN PARKING	MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL	AT GRADE PARKING	MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL	SURFACE	MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL	AT GRADE PARKING	MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL	SURFACE	MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL	AT GRADE PARKING
Land Area	2.29		2.29		2.29		2.29		2.29		2.29	
Acres	99,560		99,560		99,560		99,560		99,560		99,560	
SF	21		21		21		21		21		21	
DurAcre	175,400		175,400		175,400		175,400		175,400		175,400	
Total SF												
Residential												
Total Units	48		48		48		48		48		48	
Average Unit Size (SF)	1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200		1,200	
Monthly Rent/SF	\$1.10		\$1.10		\$1.10		\$1.10		\$1.10		\$1.10	
Monthly Rent/Unit	\$1,320		\$1,320		\$1,320		\$1,320		\$1,320		\$1,320	
Hard Costs/SF	\$75		\$75		\$75		\$75		\$75		\$75	
Hard Costs/SF (Union) 1/	\$90		\$90		\$90		\$90		\$90		\$90	
Hard Costs/Unit (Union) 1/	\$108,000		\$108,000		\$108,000		\$108,000		\$108,000		\$108,000	
Total Hard Costs (Union) 1/	\$5,184,000		\$5,184,000		\$5,184,000		\$5,184,000		\$5,184,000		\$5,184,000	
Retail												
Total SF	35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000	
Monthly Rent/SF (NNN)	\$1.25		\$1.25		\$1.25		\$1.25		\$1.25		\$1.25	
Operating Expenses/SF	\$0.25		\$0.25		\$0.25		\$0.25		\$0.25		\$0.25	
Hard Costs/SF	\$75		\$75		\$75		\$75		\$75		\$75	
Hard Costs/SF (Union) 1/	\$90		\$90		\$90		\$90		\$90		\$90	
Total Hard Costs (Union) 1/	\$3,150,000		\$3,150,000		\$3,150,000		\$3,150,000		\$3,150,000		\$3,150,000	
Parking												
Parking Space/Bedroom 2/	1.25		1.25		1.25		1.25		1.25		1.25	
Parking Space/1,000 SF Retail	4		4		4		4		4		4	
Total Parking Spaces	230		230		230		230		230		230	
Total Parking SF 3/	82,800		82,800		82,800		82,800		82,800		82,800	
Parking Type	At Grade		At Grade		At Grade		At Grade		At Grade		At Grade	
Total Parking Spaces	179		179		179		179		179		179	
Hard Costs/SF	\$6		\$6		\$6		\$6		\$6		\$6	
Hard Costs/SF (Union) 1/	\$7		\$7		\$7		\$7		\$7		\$7	
Hard Costs/Space (Union) 1/	\$2,592		\$2,592		\$2,592		\$2,592		\$2,592		\$2,592	
Parking Type	Subterranean		Subterranean		Subterranean		Subterranean		Subterranean		Subterranean	
Total Parking Spaces	51		51		51		51		51		51	
Hard Costs/SF	\$35		\$35		\$35		\$35		\$35		\$35	
Hard Costs/SF (Union) 1/	\$42		\$42		\$42		\$42		\$42		\$42	
Hard Costs/Space (Union) 1/	\$1,512		\$1,512		\$1,512		\$1,512		\$1,512		\$1,512	
Total Hard Costs (Union) 1/	\$1,225,088		\$1,225,088		\$1,225,088		\$1,225,088		\$1,225,088		\$1,225,088	
Improved Land Value												
Per Acre	\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986	
Per Unit	\$1,051,182		\$1,051,182		\$1,051,182		\$1,051,182		\$1,051,182		\$1,051,182	
Per SF	\$52,625		\$52,625		\$52,625		\$52,625		\$52,625		\$52,625	
Required Subsidy												
Site Acquisition	\$2,489,000		\$2,489,000		\$2,489,000		\$2,489,000		\$2,489,000		\$2,489,000	
Development Subsidy	\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986		\$2,525,986	
Total Required Subsidy	\$5,014,986		\$5,014,986		\$5,014,986		\$5,014,986		\$5,014,986		\$5,014,986	
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land	\$50		\$50		\$50		\$50		\$50		\$50	

1/ Union costs assume 20% mark-up of direct construction costs.

2/ Residential parking ratio is 1.25 parking spaces per bedroom. Assumes even mix between one-bedroom and two-bedroom units.

3/ Assumes 360 SF per parking space.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-B-1 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
AREA I MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL SUBTERRANEAN PARKING

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	RESIDENTIAL		RETAIL		PARKING	
			TOTAL	PER UNIT	TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PER SPACE
Net Density		21						
Number of Units		48						
Total Buildable Acres		2.29						
Land Area in SF		99,560						
Total SF (Net)		175,400	57,600	1,200	35,000		82,800	230
REVENUES								
Average Monthly Rent		\$107,110	\$63,360	\$1,320	\$43,750	\$1.25		
Annual Scheduled Rent		\$1,285,320	\$760,320	\$15,840	\$525,000	\$15.00		
Vacancy Allowance	5.0%	-\$64,266	-\$38,016	-\$792	-\$26,250			
Total Rent Collected		\$1,221,054	\$722,304	\$15,048	\$498,750			
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0	\$0						
Effective Gross Income		\$1,221,054	\$722,304	\$15,048	\$498,750			
Operating Expenses 1/	28.0% % of Scheduled Rent	\$221,640	\$212,890	\$4,435	\$8,750	\$0.25/SF		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)		\$999,414	\$509,414	\$10,613				
CAPITALIZATION RATE	8.50%							
CAPITALIZED VALUE		\$11,757,816	\$5,993,111	\$124,856	\$5,764,706			
HARD COSTS								
Construction Costs		\$9,569,088	\$5,184,000	\$108,000	\$3,150,000	\$90/SF	\$1,235,088	
Sitework	\$10,000 /unit	\$480,000						
Landscaping	1.0% % of Total Costs	\$140,000						
TOTAL HARD COSTS	71.3% % of Total Costs	\$10,189,088						
SOFT COSTS								
Permits and Fees 2/	5.6% % of Total Costs	\$792,841						
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$611,300						
Marketing	1.5% % of Capitalized Value	\$176,400						
Cost of Sale	3.0% % of Capitalized Value	\$352,734						
General Administrative	3.0% % of Capitalized Value	\$352,700						
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Capitalized Value	\$123,457						
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Capitalized Value	\$1,175,782						
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$509,500						
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	28.7% % of Total Costs	\$4,094,714						
TOTAL COSTS		\$14,283,802						
Improved Land Value		-\$2,525,986						
Per Acre		-\$1,105,182						
Per Unit		-\$52,625						
Per Land SF		-\$25.37						

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Parks, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-B-2 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS

MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL AT GRADE PARKING

AREA I

ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	RESIDENTIAL		RETAIL		PARKING	
		TOTAL	PER UNIT	TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PER SPACE
Net Density	21						
Number of Units	48						
Total Buildable Acres	2.29						
Land Area in SF	99,560						
Total SF (Net)	175,400	57,600	1,200	35,000		82,800	230
REVENUES							
Average Monthly Rent	\$107,110	\$63,360	\$1,320	\$110	\$1.25		
Annual Scheduled Rent	\$1,285,320	\$760,320	\$15,840		\$15.00		
Vacancy Allowance							
5.0%	-\$64,266	-\$38,016	-\$792		-\$26,250		
Total Rent Collected	\$1,221,054	\$722,304	\$15,048		\$498,750		
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0						
Effective Gross Income	\$1,221,054	\$722,304	\$15,048		\$498,750		
Operating Expenses 1/	\$221,640	\$212,890	\$4,435		\$8,750	\$0.25/SF	
		\$509,414	\$10,613		\$490,000		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)							
CAPITALIZATION RATE	8.50%	\$5,993,111	\$124,856				
CAPITALIZED VALUE		\$11,757,816		\$5,764,706			
HARD COSTS							
Construction Costs	\$8,797,968	\$5,184,000	\$108,000	\$90/SF	\$3,150,000	\$90/SF	\$463,968
Sitework	\$480,000						
Landscaping	\$130,000						
TOTAL HARD COSTS	\$9,407,968						
SOFT COSTS							
Permits and Fees 2/	\$766,830						
Architecture & Engineering	\$564,500						
Marketing	\$176,400						
Cost of Sale	\$352,734						
General Administrative	\$352,700						
Financing Costs	\$123,457						
Builder Profit	\$1,175,782						
Contingency	\$470,400						
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	\$3,982,804						
TOTAL COSTS	\$13,390,772						
Improved Land Value							
Per Acre	-\$1,632,955						
Per Unit	-\$714,459						
Per Land SF	-\$34,020						
	-\$16.40						

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Parks, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-1B-3 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS

AREA 2 SURFACE PARKING LOT

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	PARKING	
			TOTAL	PER SPACE PER SF
Total Buildable Acres		0.42		
Land Area in SF		18,360		
F.A.R.				
Total SF (Net)		18,360	18,360	51
REVENUES				
Average Monthly Rent		\$0		
Annual Scheduled Rent		\$0		
Vacancy Allowance	0.0%	\$0		
Total Rent Collected		\$0		
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0	\$0		
Effective Gross Income		\$0		
Operating Expenses 1/		\$0		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)		\$0		
CAPITALIZATION RATE	9.50%			
CAPITALIZED VALUE		\$0		
HARD COSTS				
Construction Costs		\$132,192		\$132,192
Sitework	5% % of Hard Costs	\$7,050		
Landscaping	1% % of Total Costs	\$1,860		
TOTAL HARD COSTS	75.5% % of Total Costs	\$141,102		
SOFT COSTS				
Permits and Fees 2/	2.9% % of Total Costs	\$5,444		
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$8,500		
Marketing	0.0% % of Total Costs	\$0		
Cost of Sale	3.0% % of Total Costs	\$4,350		
General Administrative	3.0% % of Total Costs	\$4,400		
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Total Costs	\$1,523		
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Total Costs	\$14,500		
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$7,100		
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	24.5% % of Total Costs	\$45,817		
TOTAL COSTS		\$186,919		
Improved Land Value		-\$186,919		
Per Acre		-\$443,474		
Per Land SF		-\$10.18		

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001

Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-1B-4 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
AREA I MIXED-USE, MF RENTAL AT GRADE PARKING

ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	RETAIL		PARKING	
		TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PER SPACE
Total Buildable Acres	2.29				
Land Area in SF	99,560				
F.A.R.					
Total SF (Net)	53,360	35,000		18,360	51
REVENUES					
Average Monthly Rent	\$43,750	\$43,750	\$1.25		
Annual Scheduled Rent	\$525,000	\$525,000	\$15.00		
Vacancy Allowance	5.0%	-\$26,250			
Total Rent Collected		\$498,750			
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0				
Effective Gross Income		\$498,750			
Operating Expenses 1/		\$8,750	\$0.25/SF		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)		\$490,000			
CAPITALIZATION RATE	9.50%				
CAPITALIZED VALUE		\$5,157,895			
HARD COSTS					
Construction Costs		\$3,282,192	\$90/SF	\$132,192	\$7/SF
Sitework	5% % of Hard Costs	\$175,000			
Landscaping	1% % of Total Costs	\$51,000			
TOTAL HARD COSTS	68.6% % of Total Costs	\$3,508,192			
SOFT COSTS					
Permits and Fees 2/	5.1% % of Total Costs	\$262,137			
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$210,500			
Marketing	1.5% % of Capitalized Value	\$77,400			
Cost of Sale	3.0% % of Capitalized Value	\$154,737			
General Administrative	3.0% % of Capitalized Value	\$154,700			
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Capitalized Value	\$54,158			
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Capitalized Value	\$515,789			
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$175,400			
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	31.4% % of Total Costs	\$1,604,822			
TOTAL COSTS		\$5,113,014			
Improved Land Value		\$44,881			
Per Acre		\$19,637			
Per Land SF		\$0.45			

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-1B-5 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS

AREA 4 SURFACE PARKING LOT

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	PARKING	
			TOTAL	PER SPACE PER SF
Total Buildable Acres		0.38		
Land Area in SF		16,500		
F.A.R.				
Total SF (Net)		16,500	16,500	46
REVENUES				
Average Monthly Rent		\$0		
Annual Scheduled Rent		\$0		
Vacancy Allowance		\$0		
Total Rent Collected	0.0%	\$0		
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0	\$0		
Effective Gross Income		\$0		
Operating Expenses 1/		\$0		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)		\$0		
CAPITALIZATION RATE	9.50%			
CAPITALIZED VALUE		\$0		
HARD COSTS				
Construction Costs		\$118,800		\$118,800
Sitework	5% % of Hard Costs	\$6,300		
Landscaping	1% % of Total Costs	\$1,700		
TOTAL HARD COSTS	74.4% % of Total Costs	\$126,800		
SOFT COSTS				
Permits and Fees 2/	2.9% % of Total Costs	\$4,964		
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$7,600		
Marketing	0.0% % of Total Costs	\$0		
Cost of Sale	3.0% % of Total Costs	\$4,350		
General Administrative	3.0% % of Total Costs	\$4,400		
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Total Costs	\$1,523		
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Total Costs	\$14,500		
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$6,300		
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	25.6% % of Total Costs	\$43,637		
TOTAL COSTS		\$170,437		
Improved Land Value		-\$170,437		
Per Acre		-\$449,953		
Per Land SF		-\$10.33		

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001

Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-1B-6 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
AREA 6 SINGLE STORY RETAIL AT GRADE PARKING

AREA 6	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT		RETAIL		PARKING	
		TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PER SPACE
Total Buildable Acres		0.40					
Land Area in SF		17,500					
F.A.R.							
Total SF (Net)		17,180		7,100		10,080	28
REVENUES							
Average Monthly Rent		\$8,875		\$8,875	\$1.25		
Annual Scheduled Rent		\$106,500		\$106,500	\$15.00		
Vacancy Allowance	5.0%	-\$5,325		-\$5,325			
Total Rent Collected		\$101,175		\$101,175			
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0	\$0					
Effective Gross Income		\$101,175		\$101,175			
Operating Expenses 1/		\$1,775		\$1,775	\$0.25/SF		
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)		\$99,400		\$99,400			
CAPITALIZATION RATE	9.50%						
CAPITALIZED VALUE		\$1,046,316		\$1,046,316			
HARD COSTS							
Construction Costs		\$711,576		\$639,000	\$90/SF	\$72,576	\$7/SF
Sitework	5% of Hard Costs	\$38,000					
Landscaping	1% of Total Costs	\$10,000					
TOTAL HARD COSTS	69.6% of Total Costs	\$759,576					
SOFT COSTS							
Permits and Fees 2/	5.0% of Total Costs	\$54,823					
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% of Hard Costs	\$45,600					
Marketing	1.5% of Capitalized Value	\$15,700					
Cost of Sale	3.0% of Capitalized Value	\$31,389					
General Administrative	3.0% of Capitalized Value	\$31,400					
Financing Costs	1.5% of 70% of Capitalized Value	\$10,986					
Builder Profit	10.0% of Capitalized Value	\$104,632					
Contingency	5.0% of Hard Costs	\$38,000					
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	30.4% of Total Costs	\$332,530					
TOTAL COSTS		\$1,092,106					
Improved Land Value		-\$45,790					
Per Acre		-\$113,978					
Per Land SF		-\$2.62					

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001

Concepts for Housing on Commercial Corridors

Also analyzed was options for the introduction of various rental and for-sale residential prototypes along North Long Beach's existing commercial corridors and the determination of the required subsidies for each concept. The three concepts examined range in size from 0.38 acres to three-quarters of an acre.

The total required subsidies for all of the Corridor sites range from \$0.5 million to \$2.3 million, depending on the density and form of ownership. In general, higher density and rental products require larger subsidies.

The table below on this page summarizes the total required subsidies for each of the sites.

Atlantic Avenue between Harding and Del Amo

Development costs for recommended housing products in this area are as follows. Each assumes development of three quarters of an acre and assumes 20 dwelling units/acre for townhouses & duplexes and 20 dwelling units/acre for small apartment buildings. The development subsidy for townhouses/ duplexes is approximately \$1.3 million for a for-sale product and \$1.5 million for a rental product. The development subsidy for small apartment buildings is approximately \$2 million for a for-sale product and \$2.3 million for a rental product.

Artesia Boulevard between Atlantic Avenue and Cherry Avenue

Development costs for this recommended housing product would be approximately \$480,000 for a one-third acre lot (approximately one block of development) developed with 9 units of a for-sale product.

Long Beach Boulevard north of I-710

Development costs for recommended housing product in this area would be approximately \$572,000 for a one half acre (one half block) lot developed with 7 units of a for-sale product.

Summary of Required Subsidies Housing on Commercial Corridors

Site	LONG BEACH BLVD. (North of I-710)	ARTESIA BLVD. (Between Atlantic and Cherry)
Total Required Subsidy	\$0.6 MM	\$0.5 MM

Site	ATLANTIC AVE. (Between Harding and Del Amo)			
	For-Sale, 20 Du/Ac	Rental, 20 Du/Ac	For-Sale, 24 Du/Ac	Rental, 24 Du/Ac
Total Required Subsidy	\$1.3 MM	\$1.5 MM	\$2.0 MM	\$2.3 MM



SUMMARY SPREADSHEETS

Housing on Corridors Concepts



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

SUMMARY 2 -- CORRIDOR
SUMMARY OF PRODUCT PROTOTYPES AND SUBSIDY REQUIREMENT
NORTH LONG BEACH
APRIL 2001

SITE	LONG BEACH BLVD., NORTH OF 710 FREEWAY	ARTESIA BLVD., BETWEEN ATLANTIC & CHERRY
PRODUCT	FOR-SALE SFD	FOR-SALE SFD
DENSITY	14 DU/ACRE	24 DU/ACRE

Land Area
Acres 0.52 0.38
SF 22,500 16,500
Du/Acre 14 24

Total Units 7 9
Total Retail SF -- --
Total Parking Spaces Included Included
Parking Type Included Included

Required Subsidy
Site Acquisition \$562,500 \$412,500
Development Subsidy \$9,257 \$69,560
Total Required Subsidy \$571,757 \$482,060
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land \$25 \$29

SITE	ATLANTIC AVENUE, BETWEEN HARDING & DEL AMO
PRODUCT	FOR-SALE TOWNHOME
DENSITY	20 DU/ACRE

Land Area
Acres 0.75 0.75 2.29
SF 32,670 32,670 32,670
Du/Acre 20 24 24
Total Units 15 18 18
Total Retail SF -- -- --
Total Parking Spaces 37 40 40
Parking Type At Grade Semi-Subterranean Semi-Subterranean

Required Subsidy
Site Acquisition \$816,750 \$816,750 \$816,750
Development Subsidy \$433,543 \$1,094,635 \$1,475,731
Total Required Subsidy \$1,250,293 \$1,911,385 \$2,292,481
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land \$38 \$59 \$70

SOURCE: EIP Associates; Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit I-3 / Summary of Land Residual Values for Target Sites
HOUSING ON CORRIDORS

SITE PRODUCT DENSITY	2		3	
	LONG BEACH BLVD., NORTH OF 710 FREEWAY FOR-SALE SFD 14 DU/ACRE		ARTESIA BLVD., BETWEEN ATLANTIC & CHERRY FOR-SALE SFD 24 DU/ACRE	
Site Dimensions	100 x 225		75 x 220	
Land Area (SF)	22,500		16,500	
Land Area (Acres)	0.52		0.38	
Du/Acre	14		24	
Total SF	10,150		13,050	
Residential				
Total Units	7		9	
Average Unit Size (SF)	1,450		1,450	
Price or Monthly Rent/SF	\$125		\$120	
Price or Monthly Rent	\$181,250		\$174,000	
Hard Costs/SF	\$65		\$65	
Hard Costs/SF (Union)	\$78		\$78	
Hard Costs/Unit (Union)	\$113,100		\$113,100	
Total Hard Costs (Union)	\$791,700		\$1,017,900	
Parking	Included		Included	
Parking Space/Bedroom 1/				
Total Parking SF 2/				
Total Parking Spaces				
Parking Type				
Hard Costs/SF				
Hard Costs/SF (Union)				
Hard Costs/Space (Union)				
Total Parking Costs (Union)				
Improved Land Value				
Per Acre	-\$9,257		-\$69,560	
Per Unit	-\$17,921		-\$183,638	
Per SF	-\$1,322		-\$7,729	
	-\$0.41		-\$4	
Required Subsidy				
Site Acquisition	\$562,500		\$412,500	
Development Subsidy	\$9,257		\$69,560	
Total Required Subsidy	\$571,757		\$482,060	
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land	\$25		\$29	

1/ Residential parking ratio is 1.25 parking spaces per bedroom. Assumes even mix between one-bedroom and two-bedroom units.

2/ Assumes 360 SF per parking space.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; City of Long Beach; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001

Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit I-4 / Summary of Land Residual Values for Target Sites
HOUSING ON CORRIDORS

SITE PRODUCT DENSITY	4-A	4-B	4-C	4-D
	FOR-SALE TOWNHOME 20 DU/ACRE	ATLANTIC AVENUE, BETWEEN HARDING & DEL AMO RENTAL TOWNHOME 24 DU/ACRE	FOR-SALE 2-3 STORY 24 DU/ACRE	RENTAL 2-3 STORY
Site Dimensions	--	--	--	--
Land Area (SF)	32,670	32,670	32,670	32,670
Land Area (Acres)	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
Du/Acre	20	20	24	24
Total SF	31,320	31,320	36,000	36,000
Residential				
Total Units	15	15	18	18
Average Unit Size (SF)	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Price or Monthly Rent/SF	\$125	\$115	\$125	\$110
Price or Monthly Rent	\$150,000	\$1,380	\$150,000	\$1,320
Hard Costs/SF	\$75	\$75	\$75	\$75
Hard Costs/SF (Union)	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$90
Hard Costs/Unit (Union)	\$108,000	\$108,000	\$108,000	\$108,000
Total Hard Costs (Union)	\$1,620,000	\$1,620,000	\$1,944,000	\$1,944,000
Parking				
Parking Spaced/Bedroom 1/	1.64	1.64	1.25	1.25
Total Parking SF 2/	13,320	13,320	14,400	14,400
Total Parking Spaces	37	37	40	40
Parking Type	At Grade	At Grade	Semi-Subterranean	Semi-Subterranean
Hard Costs/SF	\$6	\$6	\$35	\$35
Hard Costs/SF (Union)	\$7	\$7	\$42	\$42
Hard Costs/Space (Union)	\$2,592	\$2,592	\$15,120	\$15,120
Total Parking Costs (Union)	\$95,904	\$95,904	\$604,800	\$604,800
Improved Land Value	-\$433,543	-\$682,400	-\$1,094,635	-\$1,475,731
Per Acre	-\$578,057	-\$909,867	-\$1,459,513	-\$1,967,641
Per Unit	-\$28,903	-\$45,493	-\$60,813	-\$81,985
Per SF	-\$13	-\$21	-\$34	-\$45
Required Subsidy				
Site Acquisition	\$816,750	\$816,750	\$816,750	\$816,750
Development Subsidy	\$433,543	\$682,400	\$1,094,635	\$1,475,731
Total Required Subsidy	\$1,250,293	\$1,499,150	\$1,911,385	\$2,292,481
Total Required Subsidy/SF Land	\$38	\$46	\$59	\$70

1/ Residential parking ratio is 1.25 parking spaces per bedroom. Assumes even mix between one-bedroom and two-bedroom units.

2/ Assumes 360 SF per parking space.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; City of Long Beach; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-2 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
LONG BEACH BLVD., NORTH OF 710 FREEWAY
FOR-SALE SFD 14 DU/ACRE

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL	PER UNIT
Net Density	14 du/acre		
Number of Units	7		
Total Buildable Acres	0.52		
Land Area in SF	22,500		
Total Space (SF)			
Residential	10,150		1,450
Parking	0		0
REVENUES			
Residential		\$1,268,750	\$181,250
HARD COSTS			
Residential	\$78/SF	\$791,700	\$113,100
Parking	\$0/SF	\$0	\$0
Sitework	\$10,000 /unit	\$70,000	\$10,000
Landscaping 1/	1.5% % of Total Costs	\$13,500	\$1,929
TOTAL HARD COSTS	68.5% % of Total Costs	\$875,200	\$125,029
SOFT COSTS			
Permits and Fees 2/	6.5% % of Total Costs	\$83,700	\$11,957
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$52,512	\$7,502
Marketing	1.5% % of Revenues	\$19,033	\$2,719
Cost of Sale	2.0% % of Revenues	\$25,375	\$3,625
General Administrative	3.0% % of Revenues	\$38,066	\$5,438
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Revenues	\$13,321	\$1,903
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Revenues	\$126,700	\$18,100
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$44,100	\$6,300
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	31.5% % of Total Costs	\$407,807	\$57,544
TOTAL COSTS		\$1,278,007	\$182,572
Improved Land Value		-\$9,257	-\$1,322
Per Acre		-\$17,921	
Per Land SF		-\$0.41	

1/ Assumes landscaping is 1.5% of total project costs.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Parks, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; City of Long Beach; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001

Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-3 / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
ARTESIA BLVD., BETWEEN ATLANTIC & CHERRY
FOR-SALE SFD 24 DU/ACRE

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL	PER UNIT
Net Density	24 du/acre		
Number of Units	9		
Total Buildable Acres	0.38		
Land Area in SF	16,500		
Total Space (SF)			
Residential		13,050	1,450
Parking		0	0
REVENUES			
Residential		\$1,566,000	\$174,000
HARD COSTS			
Residential	\$78/SF	\$1,017,900	\$113,100
Parking	\$0/SF	\$0	\$0
Sitework	\$10,000 /unit	\$90,000	\$10,000
Landscaping 1/	1.5% % of Total Costs	\$21,000	\$2,333
TOTAL HARD COSTS	69.0% % of Total Costs	\$1,128,900	\$125,433
SOFT COSTS			
Permits and Fees 2/	6.6% % of Total Costs	\$107,393	\$11,933
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$67,734	\$7,526
Marketing	1.5% % of Revenues	\$23,490	\$2,610
Cost of Sale	2.0% % of Revenues	\$31,320	\$3,480
General Administrative	3.0% % of Revenues	\$46,980	\$5,220
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Revenues	\$16,443	\$1,827
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Revenues	\$156,600	\$17,400
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$56,700	\$6,300
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	31.0% % of Total Costs	\$506,660	\$56,296
TOTAL COSTS		\$1,635,560	\$181,729
Improved Land Value		-\$69,560	-\$7,729
Per Acre		-\$183,638	
Per Land SF		-\$4.22	

1/ Assumes landscaping is 1.5% of total project costs.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Parks, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; City of Long Beach; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001

Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-5A / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
ATLANTIC AVENUE, BETWEEN HARDING & DEL AMO
FOR-SALE TOWNHOME 20 DU/ACRE

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL	PER UNIT
Net Density	20 du/acre		
Number of Units	15		
Total Buildable Acres	0.75		
Land Area in SF	32,670		
Total Space (SF)			
Residential		18,000	1,200
Parking		13,320	2.47
REVENUES			
Residential		\$2,250,000	\$150,000
HARD COSTS			
Residential	\$90/SF	\$1,620,000	\$108,000
Parking	\$7/SF	\$95,904	\$6,394
Sitework	\$10,000 /unit	\$150,000	\$10,000
Landscaping 1/	1.5% % of Total Costs	\$42,000	\$2,800
TOTAL HARD COSTS	71.1% % of Total Costs	\$1,907,904	\$127,194
SOFT COSTS			
Permits and Fees 2/	6.3% % of Total Costs	\$170,290	\$11,353
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$114,474	\$7,632
Marketing	1.5% % of Revenues	\$33,750	\$2,250
Cost of Sale	2.0% % of Revenues	\$45,000	\$3,000
General Administrative	3.0% % of Revenues	\$67,500	\$4,500
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Revenues	\$23,625	\$1,575
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Revenues	\$225,000	\$15,000
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$96,000	\$6,400
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	28.9% % of Total Costs	\$775,639	\$51,709
TOTAL COSTS		\$2,683,543	\$178,903
Improved Land Value		-\$433,543	-\$28,903
Per Acre		-\$578,057	
Per Land SF		-\$13.27	

1/ Assumes landscaping is 1.5% of total project costs.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Parks, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; City of Long Beach; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001

Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-5B / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
ATLANTIC AVENUE, BETWEEN HARDING & DEL AMO
RENTAL TOWNHOME 20 DU/ACRE

ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL PER UNIT	PER SF	RETAIL TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PARKING PER UNIT	PER SF
Net Density	20								
Number of Units	15								
Total Buildable Acres	0.75								
Land Area in SF	32,670								
Total SF (Net)	31,320	18,000	1,200		0		13,320	2.47	
REVENUES									
Average Monthly Rent	\$20,700	\$20,700	\$1,380		\$1.15	\$0	\$0		\$0.00
Annual Scheduled Rent	\$248,400	\$248,400	\$16,560			\$0	\$0		\$0.00
Vacancy Allowance	5.0%	-\$12,420	-\$828			\$0	\$0		
Total Rent Collected	\$235,980	\$235,980	\$15,732			\$0	\$0		
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0	\$0							
Effective Gross Income	\$235,980	\$235,980	\$15,732			\$0	\$0		
Operating Expenses 1/	\$69,552	\$69,552	\$4,637			\$0	\$0		\$0.00/SF
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)	\$166,428	\$166,428	\$11,095			\$0	\$0		
CAPITALIZATION RATE	8.50%								
CAPITALIZED VALUE	\$1,957,876	\$1,957,976	\$130,532			\$0	\$0		
HARD COSTS									
Construction Costs	\$1,715,904	\$1,620,000	\$108,000		\$90/SF	\$0	\$0		\$0/SF
Stewwork	\$150,000								
Landscaping	\$42,000								
TOTAL HARD COSTS	\$1,907,904								\$7/SF
SOFT COSTS									
Permits and Fees 3/	\$159,377								
Architecture & Engineering	\$114,500								
Marketing	\$29,400								
Cost of Sale	\$58,739								
General Administrative	\$58,700								
Financing Costs	\$20,559								
Builder Profit	\$195,798								
Contingency	\$95,400								
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	\$732,473								
TOTAL COSTS	\$2,640,377								
Improved Land Value	-\$682,400								
Per Acre	-\$909,867								
Per Unit	-\$45,493								
Per Land SF	-\$20.89								

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Parks, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lasser & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-5C / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
ATLANTIC AVENUE, BETWEEN HARDING & DEL AMO
FOR-SALE 2-3 STORY 24 DU/ACRE

	ASSUMPTION	TOTAL	PER UNIT
Net Density	24 du/acre		
Number of Units	18		
Total Buildable Acres	0.75		
Land Area in SF	32,670		
Total Space (SF)			
Residential		21,600	1,200
Parking		14,400	2.22
REVENUES			
Residential		\$2,700,000	\$150,000
HARD COSTS			
Residential	\$90/SF	\$1,944,000	\$108,000
Parking	\$42/SF	\$604,800	\$33,600
Sitework	\$10,000 /unit	\$180,000	\$10,000
Landscaping 1/	1.5% % of Total Costs	\$63,000	\$3,500
TOTAL HARD COSTS	73.6% % of Total Costs	\$2,791,800	\$155,100
SOFT COSTS			
Permits and Fees 2/	5.8% % of Total Costs	\$221,077	\$12,282
Architecture & Engineering	6.0% % of Hard Costs	\$167,508	\$9,306
Marketing	1.5% % of Revenues	\$40,500	\$2,250
Cost of Sale	2.0% % of Revenues	\$54,000	\$3,000
General Administrative	3.0% % of Revenues	\$81,000	\$4,500
Financing Costs	1.5% % of 70% of Revenues	\$28,350	\$1,575
Builder Profit	10.0% % of Revenues	\$270,000	\$15,000
Contingency	5.0% % of Hard Costs	\$140,400	\$7,800
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	26.4% % of Total Costs	\$1,002,835	\$55,713
TOTAL COSTS		\$3,794,635	\$210,813
Improved Land Value		-\$1,094,635	-\$60,813
Per Acre		-\$1,459,513	
Per Land SF		-\$33.51	

1/ Assumes landscaping is 1.5% of total project costs.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Parks, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; City of Long Beach; Robert Charles Lesser & Co.

March 2001

Appendix 1 Land Residual and Subsidy Analysis

Exhibit II-5D / LAND RESIDUAL ANALYSIS
ATLANTIC AVENUE, BETWEEN HARDING & DEL AMO
RENTAL 2-3 STORY 24 DU/ACRE

ASSUMPTION	TOTAL PROJECT	TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL PER UNIT	PER SF	RETAIL TOTAL	PER SF	TOTAL	PARKING PER UNIT	PER SF
Net Density	24								
Number of Units	18								
Total Buildable Acres	0.75								
Land Area in SF	32,670								
Total SF (Net)	36,000	21,600	1,200		0		14,400	2.22	
REVENUES									
Average Monthly Rent	\$23,760	\$23,760	\$1,320	\$1.10	\$0	\$0.00			
Annual Scheduled Rent	\$285,120	\$285,120	\$15,840		\$0	\$0.00			
Vacancy Allowance	5.0%	-\$14,256			\$0				
Total Rent Collected	\$270,864	\$270,864	\$15,048		\$0				
Other Income / Parking fees	\$0								
Effective Gross Income	\$270,864	\$270,864	\$15,048		\$0				
Operating Expenses 1/	\$79,834	\$79,834	\$4,435		\$0	\$0.00/SF			
NET OPERATING INCOME (NOI)	\$191,030	\$191,030	\$10,613		\$0				
CAPITALIZATION RATE	8.50%								
CAPITALIZED VALUE	\$2,247,416	\$2,247,416	\$124,856		\$0				
HARD COSTS									
Construction Costs	\$2,548,800	\$1,944,000	\$108,000	\$90/SF	\$0	\$0/SF	\$604,800		\$42/SF
Sitework	\$180,000								
Landscaping	\$63,000								
TOTAL HARD COSTS	\$2,791,800								
SOFT COSTS									
Permits and Fees 2/	\$207,385								
Architecture & Engineering	\$167,500								
Marketing	\$33,700								
Cost of Sale	\$67,422								
General Administrative	\$67,400								
Financing Costs	\$23,598								
Builder Profit	\$224,742								
Contingency	\$139,600								
TOTAL SOFT COSTS	\$931,347								
TOTAL COSTS	\$3,723,147								
Improved Land Value									
Per Acre	-\$1,475,731								
Per Unit	-\$1,987,641								
Per Land SF	-\$81,985								
	-\$45.17								

1/ Includes Operations, Taxes, Insurance, and Replacement Reserves.

2/ Includes School, Sewer, Parks, Transportation, Permit, Plan Check, Environmental, and Public Art Requirement Fees.

SOURCE: Siegel Diamond Architecture; Blair Commercial; Berro Property Management; City of Long Beach, Building Department; Robert Charles Lester & Co.

March 2001



Appendix 2
**Workshop
Summaries**



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #I

Saturday, August 26, 2000, 10:00 AM – 2:00 PM

Ramona Park

Summary Notes

STATION 3 - OVERALL ISSUES

What are the BEST things about North Long Beach?

The many different types of people

Real neighborhoods that are generationally diverse

The friendly people & the great neighborhoods close to everything

The multi-cultural area – diversity of people & good location

The diversity and potential

We all get along and cherish our diversity

Closeness to major freeways

Good residential neighborhoods, varied demographics (income differential), good access to areas outside of Long Beach,

Quiet, self-contained, sleepy part of town. Some beautiful, quaint shady streets

Jay Midob [?]

Diversity – feeling of community

Magnificent old growth trees

LBCC is great for enrichment – my area is run down but getting better

Police Dept. at Shearer Park

People, large number of volunteers

Neighborhoods

“It’s Home”

Certain areas have little crime

Large African American population call this home

Large lots, low purchase price for homes

Bikes 90800 [?]

Citizen involvement

Diversity & people

Individual architecture – “Belmont North” with garage parking, custom built homes (no tract home, no clone homes)

The people & diversity

The people

Cohesive neighborhood groups which work together toward common goals, “unity”

Partnership between public agencies (specifically the Police Department) and the neighborhoods

The diverse community & the acceptance of each diverse culture

What things about North Long Beach are “not so good?”

Truck traffic and parking

More police patrols please

Ficus trees

Overcrowding – population is too much in North Long Beach & appearance of homes is not so good

Rent companies raise rent every 3-6 months, hurting low income people

Run down areas

Roads are getting rough

Too many Run down areas

Sidewalks need to be repaired & drainage needs repair along streets

Some renters don’t necessarily have any pride in their homes. Kids hang out on corners – destructive of public property

Truck traffic

Other parts of LB being frightened about coming to the top of the town

Deterioration of upkeep of properties

Some people don’t appreciate the places to take the kids (the park) and make a mess of the place.



Trees & streets

Lack of trees – high density housing – high density rentals

Too many run down little businesses

Poor vehicle access to commercial corridors, inadequate parking in commercial areas, antiquated lot shapes in some areas & lack of community pride.

The empty houses and uncared for streets.

Decline in property & real estate value

Orange Ave. in Bixby in poor repair

The school system

Increase in apartment & multi-family dwellings

The abandonment of the infrastructure by the City

Mixed zoning not always compatible

Overcrowded schools

Unmanaged rental units

The unkempt facilities along Obispo – run down homes & businesses

Old trees – bad people – a lot of drugs

Limited telecommunication infrastructure – how can we reduce digital divide w/NO infrastructure?

Lowest ratio of parking spaces to population in Long Beach

Ficus trees too big

What would you like to see STAY THE SAME about North Long Beach in the future?

We should not take open space at Shear Park

KFC in the same location

I love the medians on Atlantic & the possibility of three canopy they could be providing

Shady streets, quaint neighborhoods

Residential areas to sa [sic]

Nice parks, nice quiet residential area, diversity

Good neighbors

I like the neighborhood feeling. Try to keep a distinctive look throughout area.

Preserve the unique 50's architecture. Maintain a small community atmosphere

Neighborhood attitude

Shear Park

Jordan High School, friendliness

Keep park areas for open space

Sense of community diversity, old growth trees, homes (bedroom community)

Bike 90800 [?]

Nothing should "stay the same," we should only progress.

What would you like to see CHANGE in North Long Beach in the future?

Truck traffic & parking

Sidewalk repairs & street maintenance

We need to make the parents understand or better yet teach them the importance of a clean neighborhood so that they can pass that on to the children, because if the don't no one else will.

Get rid of the apartments on Andy.

More police presence & action (x5)

More pocket parks, more Small businesses.

Require (city ordinance?) all businesses to maintain their properties (keep trash picked-up, landscaping, etc)

Property value increasing

H2O center dividers; plant/improve them – Add more street trees, decrease pocket parks

Ragged buildings

Police on bikes – direct contact with citizens – "walk the beat" when you know the cop on the block. (x2)

Uniformity in looks – architecture

More parks, green space within the neighborhoods.

No residential div. B/ Del Amo & Wardlow road on Long Beach Blvd.

Need street median & better traffic flow on Long Beach Blvd.

Street & sidewalk repairs.

More consistency in over look & distinctive gateway entrances.



Dollies property turned into a park
Commercial buildings taken better care of - neatness & pride
Reduce business sprawl. Intelligent development of industrial areas. Good jobs nearby "shopping"
Need fabric store
More median street trees – traffic calming on major corridors
Less police action at Atlantic & Artesia
Put larger sidewalks on LB Blvd.
I don't want to live here
An integrated sense of neighborhood
More daily use business – groceries, dry goods, etc.
Teach children & adults responsibility regarding litter
People to take pride in area & clean-up after themselves.
Schools are too large – should be broken down. Jordan HS / Hamilton
Speed bumps to slow traffic on Indiana – dangerous traffic
Provide a more leisurely shopping on other commercial business atmosphere – Recognize the importance of motor vehicle use to make household purchases – Make (?) more convenient to us than malls and shopping center in Lakewood, Signal Hill and Cerritos
Bury power lines (unsightly)

What is the MOST IMPORTANT issue facing the residents of North Long Beach?

Development under Edison high voltage lines
Sidewalks damaged by trees – no money to repair
The building and design of North Division PD
How to improve area/property values
Noise & street repair
Reduction & limitation of truck traffic
Program & education of residents on garbage control & discarding items in the street
North sub-station
Pride in ownership – safety to walk the neighborhood – overall cleanliness of city
Safety & cleanliness
Crime
We need to put redevelopment money into N.L.B. not Bixby
Parkways & streets need repaving & marking
Parking
The police station taking over Shearer Park
Increase residential densities that existing infrastructure can't support – Poor access to retail businesses – inadequate parking adjacent to many businesses
Mixed 2 story residential & commercial is OK if residents can't stop commerce below)
Personal safety, traffic flow, noise, population density & property value
Street & sidewalk upgrade & repair
Personal safety, upkeep at parks & safety in parks
Entry ways into Long Beach Via North, West & East should be marked clearly – some even dramatically
Run down commercial areas
Appearance and perception
The elimination of the perception that North Long Beach is a crime area and not an area to live
Being informed about what is happening between neighborhoods
Keeping sub police station in Shearer Park
The need for a substation east of Cherry somewhere on South

What would you change about the way things are built in North Long Beach?

Eliminate raised dividers in Atlantic Ave retail areas – Provide left turn on U turn arrows to allow better access to stores – Establish shuttle to bus station (?) residential to retail areas (including schools) – restore foundation and establish pocket park at San Antonio Drive and Atlantic N.E. corner – provide better access to Atlantic Place and encourage restoration & small retail businesses – Make N.L.B a major destination and not a barrier in the (?) of destinations outside of the area.
Super market
Pride in ownership
Mixed housing & commercial – No industrial only areas



Codes to keep industrial from encroaching on residential
 Follow Paramount's lead with how the city buildings match, cleanliness...
 School zoning – there are schools closer to me than the schools my children are designated to attend
 Buildings lack any architecture or design – overuse on the “big box” theme
 Lack of uniform code – more uniformity in color & scheme
 Add more parks
 Put police station at Doolies
 I would like the lots bigger
 Move residential out of business section
 Design standards - continuity of buildings - require green space & adequate parking
 Move rundown multi-family dwellings out of single family neighborhoods
 Please no more mini-malls
 The amount of multiple family dwelling
 Add wider sidewalks and street trees along Long Beach Blvd.
 Raze multi-family dwellings
 More consistency in design, especially signage on businesses

STATION 4 - LAND USES

Commercial Areas

What types of stores would you like to see more of in North Long Beach?

More quality - less cheap stuff
 Outdoor dining along Long Beach Blvd.
 Museums, arts & entertainment
 Major grocery store (x3)
 No more mini-markets – a new store in NLB north of 710 freeway.
 Something that would provide good jobs for people
 Clothing stores – Misc. service store – theaters
 Larger volume stores – petsmart – women's/men's clothing – bookstore & Services – shoe repair – dry cleaning
 Fabric store
 Music stores, book stores, sporting good stores – upper scale retail stores
 Food
 Need a grocery store on the west side
 Sporting goods, a gameworks center
 Music stores, book stores, sporting goods store, clothing store
 Entertainment
 I think we have enough
 Trader Joe's type stores – more restaurants – high quality markets
 None – residential only
 Restaurants (x2)
 Important stores – Arts & Crafts – teacher's supply

What types of stores would you like to see less of in North Long Beach?

Liquor stores(x12)
 Adult book stores, (x4)
 Pawn shops (x2)
 Spiritual advisors
 Auto repair (x2)
 “mom & pop” stores
 Thrift Stores (x5)
 “99-Cent” stores (x4)
 Pawn shops
 Laundry
 Store-front churches (x2)
 Porn theaters
 Mini marts



Mini malls
Bars (x3)
Old buildings

What ideas do you have for re-using older, smaller 2 and 3 story office buildings in North Long Beach?

Convert to lofts – businesses on first floor (x3)
Modernize them
Community centers for all ages (x5)
Green places
A bulldozer? Convert to live/work space (strictly owner occupied), artist lofts, law offices, medical uses, etc.
Small library / Resume & Interview Services
Remove and replace if necessary
Increase parking as needed
Job training / adult schools (x4)
Eliminate some & convert others to residences
Revitalize the pedestrian traffic and create trendy retail
Tear them down and make parks
Tear down, put in parking/green space, open airy spots, (well-maintained)
Rent them
Rebuild to one story

What types of offices and office buildings (if any) would you like to see in North Long Beach?

None (x5)
Minimal
Let's fill the one's we have
Doctor's / Dentist's offices (x3)
Pretty
Hi-Tech, good quality jobs
Professional offices / attorney offices (x2)

Statement: "My nearest neighborhood shopping area meets my regular daily needs (for groceries, videos, shoe-repair, dry-cleaning, etc.).

AGREE: 11 dots

NEUTRAL: 0 dots

DISAGREE: 23 dots

Comments:

- (Disagree) *I live one block from a grocery store, but it feels unsafe, especially in the evening. All my shopping is done several miles away.*
- (Disagree) *I must drive to all shopping areas*

Statement: "Large Stores, such as K-Mart & Target, fulfill most if not all of my shopping needs."

AGREE: 16 dots

NEUTRAL: 4 dots

DISAGREE: 18 dots

Question: "Where do you do most of your shopping?"

LARGE STORES IN NORTH LONG BEACH: 3 dots

SMALL, NEIGHBORHOOD STORES IN NORTH LONG BEACH: 1 dot

STORES OUTSIDE OF NORTH LONG BEACH: 30 dots

Comments:

- (Small Neighborhood Stores in NLB): *Some Grocery from ethnic market across street*
- (Small Neighborhood Stores in NLB): *When possible*
- (Small Neighborhood Stores in NLB): *Most stores are ratty looking and we sometimes feel unsafe in parking lots*
- (Stores Outside NLB): *Lakewood Ctr. Mall (x3)*
- (Stores Outside NLB): *Other side (South-East of Downey & south)*
- (Stores Outside NLB): *Except grocery & drugstore (Vons/Sav-on)*

Statement: "I think there are enough neighborhood serving offices (such as medical, dental, insurance, etc.) in North Long Beach"

AGREE: 5 dots

NEUTRAL: 4 dots

DISAGREE: 27 dots

Statement: "I like the idea of investing in hi-tech infrastructure (fiber optic cable, etc.) to attract new hi-tech companies.

AGREE: 26 dots

NEUTRAL: 2 dots

DISAGREE: 0 dots

Question: "Do you operate a business out of your home?"

YES: 9 dots

NO: 27 dots

Comments:

- *Many home business opportunities exist and should be encouraged along with respect for traffic & neighborhood concerns*

Question: "Do you agree that some portions of the existing commercial corridors (Portions of Artesia, Long Beach, Atlantic, Market, & South) should be reused as something other than commercial space?"

YES, CONVERT THEM TO MIXED USE AREAS (RES & COMMERCIAL): 17 dots

Comments:

- *Use existing building to do this wherever possible.*

YES, CONVERT THEM TO RESIDENTIAL: 9 dots

Comments:

- *Leave LB Blvd. South of San Antonio commercial w/o any mixed use residential development.*
- *No residential on LB Blvd between Wardlow & San Antonio*

YES, CONVERT THEM TO INDUSTRIAL: 7 dots

YES, CONVERT THEM TO SOMETHING NOT SUGGESTED HERE: 0 dots

NO, LEAVE THESE AREAS AS THEY ARE: 5 dots

Mapping Exercise: "Place a GREEN dot on the top 3 areas of North Long Beach that you think "Village" or "Mixed-Use"

- *The majority of green dots are placed along Atlantic Avenue, between Harding Street and just south of Market Street.*
- *Another collection of green dots are centered on Long Beach Boulevard just south of Market Street.*

Mapping Exercise: "Place a RED dot on the top 3 areas of North Long Beach that you think new large scale shopping centers should be."

- *The majority of red dots are placed around the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and Long Beach Boulevard.*
- *Other collections of red dots are located in the Bixby Knolls area (at the site of the new Ralph's grocery store development); near the intersection of Long Beach Boulevard and the 91 Freeway; and on the north side of South Street, just east of Cherry Street.*

Mapping Exercise: "Place a GREEN dot on the top 3 commercial areas that you think should be changed or re-used as RESIDENTIAL areas."

- *The majority of green dots are placed around the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and Long Beach Boulevard and along Artesia Boulevard between Atlantic Avenue and Cherry Avenue.*

Mapping Exercise: "Place a RED dot on the top 3 commercial areas that you think should be changed or re-used as INDUSTRIAL areas."

- *Red dots are clustered in the following areas: the east side of Paramount Boulevard south of Artesia Boulevard; the north side of South Street just east of Cherry Avenue; the northeast corner of Atlantic Avenue and Artesia Boulevard.*

Mapping Exercise: "Place a GREEN dot on the top 3 areas of North Long Beach that you think are "pedestrian friendly."

- *Green dots are located primarily near the intersection of Atlantic Avenue and Market Street, as well as on Atlantic Avenue in Bixby Knolls.*



Mapping Exercise: "Place a RED dot on the top 3 areas of North Long Beach that you think are NOT "pedestrian friendly."

- Red dots are clustered in the following areas: Long Beach Boulevard (all portions); Atlantic Avenue in-between Artesia Boulevard & Harding Street and in-between Market Street & the railroad corridor; Artesia Boulevard near Orange Avenue; and Artesia Boulevard near Downey Avenue.

Industrial Areas

We have heard that truck traffic to industrial areas is an important issue. What and where are the problems? How can they be prevented?

Prohibit truck parking on city streets and vacant lots
Keep out of residential areas – keep on truck routes
Require trucks to use I 10 Freeway
L.B. Blvd. & Del Amo – there is parking problems on old Red Fox Lot. They park at night
Route them away from residential areas
Long Beach Blvd. – restrict access to large trucks – Wardlow to 710 Fwy @ LA River
LB Blvd. Islands with trees should help
Reduce / Eliminate truck traffic north of 710 Fwy on LB Blvd.
Build the roads before you build large commercial or Post container facilities
Disallow thru truck traffic
Keep industrial areas close to freeways
Provide vehicle barriers between industrial and residential areas
Eliminate L.B. Blvd as a designated truck route
Consolidate industry and route trucks directly to & from
Keep industry in truck route designated area
Odors in the air near Artesia & Paramount St.

What type of industries should be recruited to locate in North Long Beach?

Light Mfg / Indus. (x7)
Med. Industrial (x2)
High tech & light industrial
Environmentally clean / non-polluting (x2)
None
Hi-Tech (x6)
Light clean and no heavy industrial or hazardous storage – must be compatible with residential
Basic industries that employ low-skilled workers (Too much emphasis on high-skilled industries).
Noise due to tires and train crossings need constraining

What types of industrial uses should NOT be in North Long Beach?

Container storage (x5)
Truck & Semi-Truck Parking, Fueling and Repair (x2)
Smoke / Heavy Polluters (x4)
Recycling centers
Thrift Stores
Cheap Furniture stores
Any (x2)
Large warehouse facilities that generate lots of port-related truck traffic
Heavy Industry (x4)
Hazardous Material (x2)
Noisy
Industries that attract workers from outside the area
Nothing that requires semi's



Statement: "Industry in North Long Beach creates job opportunities for the residents of North Long Beach."

AGREE: 10 dots

NEUTRAL: 0 dots

DISAGREE: 10 dots

Comments:

- *Does create jobs. Not necessarily for the NLB residents.*

Statement: "More industries locating in North Long Beach is a good idea."

AGREE: 15 dots

NEUTRAL: 1 dots

DISAGREE: 10 dots

Statement: "The residents of North Long Beach work in the industrial areas of North Long Beach"

AGREE: 4 dots

NEUTRAL: 3 dots

DISAGREE: 18 dots

Statement: "The Southern California Edison corridor (the power line corridor) should be re-used as an industrial area.

AGREE: 10 dots

NEUTRAL: 0 dots

DISAGREE: 15 dots

Comments:

- *(Agree): Should have its own ingress/egress to the 710 Fwy.*
- *(Agree): Light Industrial, High Tech*
- *(Disagree): Exit & entrance should be away from LB Blvd. If it must be changed.*
- *(Disagree): It would create too much truck traffic*
- *(Disagree): Should be left as our open area*
- *(Disagree): Make a "green space" we do not need (?) of containers*
- *(Disagree): How would we prevent its use as a container storage facility?*

Statement: "Industrial areas should not be next to residential areas, unless there is adequate distance, hedges, trees, or other buffering.

AGREE: 27 dots

NEUTRAL: 0 dots

DISAGREE: 1 dots

Statement: "Some residential areas should be converted to industrial uses."

AGREE: 6 dots

NEUTRAL: 3 dots

DISAGREE: 16 dots

Mapping Exercise: "Place a GREEN dot on the top 3 areas where new industrial areas should be located"

- *Green dots are located: Along Artesia Boulevard in between the Los Angeles River and Cherry Avenue; Northeast of the intersection of the 91 and 710 Freeways.*

Mapping Exercise: "Place a RED dot on the top 3 residential areas that could be converted to industrial use."

- *Red dots are clustered in the following areas: On the east side of Paramount Boulevard south of Artesia Boulevard; Southeast of the intersection of Long Beach Boulevard and the 91 Freeway.*



Community Facilities

What types of community facilities are needed in North Long Beach?

More facilities for children to play – get off the street. Parks in the neighborhoods & skateboarding areas
Parks in residential areas(x5)
Job training facilities / One-Stops (x2)
Nice open spaces, green spaces (x2)
Safe parks (x3)
Entertainment for kids
Senior Housing (x2)
Pool
Some small (neighborhood) parks or “pocket-parks” on the many vacant lots.(x2)
Shuttle busses connecting retail corridor with residential areas and schools
Animal training center
1 more police station
Better streets, better tree maintenance, underground utilities
A good coffee shop or family restaurant
Schools
Another High School or Junior High
Police Sub-Station at parks (x2)
Community meeting room facilities. (Copier, white boards, tables, chairs, etc.)
Expand police station
Additional public library

What is good or bad about the existing community facilities in North Long Beach?

The parks are unsafe in the evening
Mixed zoning with apartments and single family dwellings indiscriminately mixed
Need park supervisor, need park programs for kids out of school for holidays, vacations
Park restrooms, buildings run down, schools overcrowded, not safe
None
Kids play in Laundromats and on streets
Not enough street trees and benches in commercial areas
Lack of management of apartment dwellings
Some high class areas remain unaffected while more moderate income housing are losing value due to poor access
Better parking and access
Need more open house days to share what is there
I was in a park bathroom (Deforest) it was dirty and lacking TP.

Statement: “There are enough parks in North Long Beach.”

AGREE: 5 dots

NEUTRAL: 3 dots

DISAGREE: 34 dots

Comments:

- (Disagree) Ramona Park needs more efficient people working her and giving more help. More entertainment.

Statement: “There are enough community centers in North Long Beach.”

AGREE: 2 dots

NEUTRAL: 3 dots

DISAGREE: 39 dots

Statement: “There are enough libraries in North Long Beach”

AGREE: 5 dots

NEUTRAL: 8 dots

DISAGREE: 24 dots



Statement: "I support the idea of multi-purpose facilities, where one site is located for more than one use, (Schools, parks, libraries, etc.)

AGREE: 35 dots

NEUTRAL: 2 dots

DISAGREE: 1 dots

Comments:

- (Agree) Except parking cannot be flatland – must be structures, below grade if necessary.

Statement: "An additional police station is needed in North Long Beach."

AGREE: 34 dots

NEUTRAL: 3 dots

DISAGREE: 7 dots

Comments:

- (Agree) How about a "store front" near Ramona Park area?
- (Disagree) The existing trailer-based substation needs replacing, but one substation is enough
- (Disagree) No additional beyond Scherer
- The last time I saw the police in action, there were 8 cars around one black male!

Statement: "There are too many social service providers in North Long Beach."

AGREE: 14 dots

NEUTRAL: 9 dots

DISAGREE: 10 dots

Mapping Exercise: "Place a GREEN dot on the top 3 places where new parks and community centers should go."

- Green dots are scattered throughout the planning area, with no real clustering. This may indicate a general, area-wide need for additional parks & community centers.

Mapping Exercise: "Place a RED dot on the top 3 places where new parks and community centers should go."

- Red dots are scattered throughout the planning area, with a small cluster on Long Beach Boulevard just south of Market Street. This may indicate a general, area-wide need for additional schools.

Residential Areas

What types of housing would you like to see in North Long Beach in the future?

Owner-occupied housing (8)

Single family homes (x16)

Better quality townhomes (with enough parking)(x2)

Senior housing (x3)

"No more apartments" (x6)

Renovated (x2)

Rent-to-own housing

Better management of existing housing

"No more condos" (x2)

Homes with enough garage or off-street parking

Mixed use: ground floor commercial/residential above, along Atlantic N. of South St.

Infill single family (a la 20th & Hill on Atlantic) in rundown single family areas

Should new housing be owner-occupied, renter-occupied, or both?

Owner (x16)

Both, but mostly owner (x5)



Statement: "There is not enough affordable housing in North Long Beach."

AGREE: 8 dots

NEUTRAL: 1 dot

DISAGREE: 20 dots

Comments:

- (Agree) *There is not enough affordable housing with 3 bedrooms*
- (Agree) *Glut of multi-family housing – high vacancy rate*
- (Neutral) *Affordable to who?*
- (Disagree) *There are a lot of units that cannot be sold because they are one-bedroom or run down*

Statement: "There is not enough senior housing in North Long Beach."

AGREE: 21 dots

NEUTRAL: 2 dots

DISAGREE: 6 dots

Statement: "Housing in North Long Beach is generally in good condition."

AGREE: 4 dots

NEUTRAL: 5 dots

DISAGREE: 25 dots

Comments:

- (Agree) *Huge increase in new fences, new paint, new roofs.*
- (Neutral) *The people that move in are the ones that make it a BAD condition. Instead of keeping the place up they make it worse by letting the place go.*
- *Some is, some not, rentals-no, owner occupied – yes*
- (Disagree) *Some are good some are bad*
- (Disagree) *Needs serious efforts to improve communities overall*
- (Disagree) *Citizens should keep property up*
- (Disagree) *Low maintenance of affordable housing associated with high crime rate areas*
- (Disagree) *General condition poor for multi-family*

Do you like the idea of the existing underused commercial corridors (Portions of Artesia, Long Beach, Atlantic, Market, & South) being re-used as residential areas?

YES – CONVERT THEM TO SINGLE FAMILY HOMES: 11 dots

YES – CONVERT THEM TO SMALL APARTMENT BUILDINGS OR CONDOS,

SOME WITH STORES ON THE FIRST FLOOR: 9 dots

Comments:

- *Mixed use of residential & commercial is not a good idea!*
- *Where is this? Is this possible in our community?*
- *In certain areas it will work, others not – pick and choose*
- *That's what these corridors were originally designed for*
- *Not high-rises – ensure enough parking & green space – less dense*

YES- CONVERT THEM TO TOWNHOUSES: 10 dots

YES- CONVERT THEM TO SOMETHING NOT SUGGESTED HERE: 0 dots

NO- LEAVE THESE AREAS AS THEY ARE: 8 dots

Comments:

- *Long Beach is overpopulated. There aren't enough schools or classrooms as it is. Why build more homes for people we can't even help!*
- *No residential rezone for commercial only*
- *No residential development (not even mixed use) in L.B. Blvd from Del Amo to Wardlow.*

Mapping Exercise: "Place a GREEN dot on the top 3 places where new housing should be developed."

- *Green dots are scattered throughout the planning area and no real trend is apparent.*

Mapping Exercise: "Place a RED dot on the top 3 places where other uses (industrial, commercial, etc.) could be converted to new housing."

- *Red dots are scattered throughout the planning area and no real trend is apparent.*



STATION 6 - FINAL COMMENTS

Renters are not enemies

Require Owners to maintain their rental properties

Return E-W corridors to residential (except South Street east of Cherry)

Get rid of business/strip mall sprawl; enhance and improve business nodes

We need to see some improvement on Long Beach Boulevard between Del Amo and 56th Street

The area between Wardlow & Del Amo should NOT be rezoned and should stay as they were zoned in 1993-94; we worked too hard with Jeff Kellogg to change all of this – we do not need ANY more housing in our areas! We do not have enough room in our 2 schools Longfellow & Los Cerritos.

Very informative presentation

I like the forward movement in the Bixby Knolls Shopping Center – Orchard Supply Hardware is great. I'm waiting for more improvements – the parking lot is great. I'm looking forward to the opening of the Ralph's being built on Carson & Long Beach Blvd. And welcome the prospect of Trader Joe's. I hope to see more new restaurants and a music store would be nice along with a bookstore.

Your description of North Long Beach & the drawings you use make it look like NLB is a single entity out in the blue - that is NOT the case – You must look at the larger area to have a good analysis. Solutions you propose are Band-Aid in nature. For real improvement you need a more global – dramatic solution.

Teach the children to NOT LITTER! Teach the parents too. We all have responsibility!

Please! No residential building until more schools are built. Clean up North Long Beach. Plant more trees, landscape, make North Long Beach look as good as Paramount.

NLB needs the expansion of Police Department at Scherer Park! Little useful sections of the park will be impacted and benefit of a station will be overwhelming!

Something needs to be done about Andy Street.

How many people is skare [sic] to North Long Beach. A lot of drugs faster cars a lot of smoke dirty streets.

Have transportation/community/info centers on streets near bus stops to dispense info and provide connection

Why is there a two story apartment building at South & Orange? Southeast beside the gas station?



COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2

Saturday, February 3, 2001, 10:00 AM – 2:00 PM

Houghton Park Community Center, 6301 Myrtle Avenue

Summary Notes

STATION 3: AREA WIDE PLAN

Area-Wide Plan Concepts

"The basic concepts of the area-wide plan are right for North Long Beach."

Agree: 22 / 1 Comment:

"Except for below Del Amo"

Neutral: 0

Disagree: 7 / 2 Comments:

"Start at Greenleaf and extend South; LB Blvd.!!"

"Vacant commercial areas should be converted to parking lots which would assist remaining businesses."

"The general ideal of changing parts of the existing commercial/retail areas along major streets is a good one."

Agree: 26 / 2 Comments:

"LB Blvd. North of 710 should be increased for residential use, forwarding commercial usage to the designated node"

"Mixed commercial on South Street should be moved toward residential (i.e. no new business uses should be allowed/built."

Neutral: 2 / 2 Comments:

"I have real concerns about mixing commercial & residential, especially without green space"

"Ensure that design guidelines are developed PRIOR to any residential developments – so that design is consistent with surrounding neighborhoods."

Disagree: 5 / 3 Comments:

"Commercial & residential should not be mixed!"

"You have failed to grasp the distinction between North Long Beach and Greater Bixby Knolls. What fits one does not necessarily fit the other!"

"I like the general idea of creating a "Village Center" in North Long Beach."

Agree: 31 / 4 Comments:

"Too much done below Del Amo"

"Bixby Knolls also needs to develop it's village center on Atlantic between San Antonio & Bixby as well."

"The village center would be a great addition to North Long Beach."

"It is important to develop a "village center" but it is mainly residential and needs to remain that way."

Neutral: 0

Disagree: 1 / 1 Comment:

"If the Village Center revolves around Atlantic & South – what happens to areas west and north?"

Question: "What are the POSITIVE aspects of the Area-Wide Plan?"

Comments:

"Need to provide jobs close to residential areas."

"At least we have a plan – the areas needs direction & planned improvement."

"Creating affordable, yet quality, destructive residential neighborhoods along old commercial corridors along with pocket parks, Drive through Paramount to see what they've done in that city."

"Reducing commercial retail. Increasing single family residential / Village Center"

"Creates an opportunity for an "interactive community""

"Clean up & rehab. of the corridors & the existing housing"

"No multi-family rental units or apartments."

"Good first impression! – Improves gateway to City."



"Improved architectural appearance of buildings."
"Elimination of large apartment complexes – also, track traffic from residential area."
"It would be nice to clean up L.B. Blvd. from Artesia to Greenleaf – repave streets & sidewalks."
"Jobs would be one positive outlook."
"Consolidate usage so commercial and residential & industry don't collide with values – appropriate land usage."
"Village center at Atlantic and South – great."
"Added greenspace."
"Except for residential development along the Edison Right-of-Way on River."
"I would like the LB Blvd. area between Victoria & Artesia to be cleaned up!"
"Gives a general over all appearance"
"I like the idea of community areas on Long Beach Blvd. between San Antonio & Bixby (library, community center, art center, etc.)."

Question: "What are the NEGATIVE aspects of the Area-Wide Plan?

Comments:

"Ignores transportation issues regarding access."
"Pedestrian Oriented Zoning in Long Beach ignores that most people drive and want convenient parking and access."
"Village customers want to park within 50' and be able to park and (?) of one store."
"Problems of mixing retail/commercial without green space."
"Haven't seen \$\$\$ figures yet!"
"Too much in Bixby Knolls – not enough in N. Long Beach"
"Residential one family homes."
"No garage doors for store fronts and more landscaping."
"Not enough parking."
"You can do the most for LB by getting good schools."
"Adding industrial – not enough green space strips along corridors."
"Increased density and rental units."
"Does not address possible zoning problems in residential neighborhoods."
"Bixby Knolls needs to take 2nd place to redevelopment N. of Del Amo"
"If converting vacant/underused commercial buildings into residential housing, local schools will be severely impacted! N. Long Beach schools are already full."
"Need to look at Nodes in Bixby Knolls rather than developing the entire street."
"Where would you place parking?"
"No more apartments – single family residential with affordable \$ yet upper scale & landscaped."

Commercial Areas - Village Center

Statement: "The idea of a "Village Center" at Atlantic Avenue and South Street is a good one."

Agree: 30

Neutral: 0

Disagree: 2

Question: "What do you think about the idea of a Village Center near Atlantic Ave. & South St.?"

No Starbucks!

Need for Parking (x7)

Raze buildings along commercial corridor to make parking available adjacent to "Village."

Bixby Knolls Village Center too!! Bixby-San Antonio.

Existing business need to clean up the streets around their properties.

It's a good position to put a village center but, they would have to make a fairly large parking lot.

I approve

Two of us oppose

South St. needs to turn lanes so traffic moves more smoothly - this way we can get to the village center.

I will not patronize without appropriate parking & access.

Strongly agree with adequate parking & landscaping.

Parking a problem, but concept good.

Great idea – parking and green spaces important.

Develop small green area to sit down, drink coffee, etc.



Question: "What types of shops, restaurants, services, & community facilities would you like to see in the Village Center?"

Standards for store fronts and landscaping. No prison-type fencing – no "garage-door" storefronts.

Get rid of Albertson's and put in new market.

Coffee Shop! (I prefer "It's a Grind" – keep Super Mex)

Grocery Store

Need a good/healthy place for breakfast & lunch

Sit-down restaurant (x2)

Community resource center – serving business & residential

No more fast food

Restaurants & good quality – community meeting spots

I would like to see shops where you can have fun and everything else – one great thing would be a food court or a skatepark and/or arcade.

Shops with sundries, etc. Like an old fashioned dime store

Coffee House – Buono's Pizza

Meeting room

Movie Theater (x2)

Statement: "It is a good idea to have BOTH community facilities and retail uses in the Village Center."

Agree: 25

Neutral: 1

Disagree: 2

Statement: "It is a good idea to have buildings in the Village Center with shops on the first floor and quality apartments/condominiums on upper floors."

Agree: 20 / 3 Comments

As long as there is Parking!

Agree – but need green space and parking

Must have adequate off street parking – not visible from street (Arnold's)

Neutral: 2

Disagree: 6 / 1 Comment

It's impossible to make a business owner live above a work space. So additional housing density will result, and is NOT desirable.

Statement: "It is a good idea to remove some existing housing behind the commercial buildings in order to create parking areas and small parks."

Agree: 25

Neutral: 3

Disagree: 2 / 1 Comment

Decrease commercial and retail empty buildings – Raze empty stores for parks and parking

Commercial Areas – Neighborhood/Convenience Node

Question: "Do you agree with the location of these nodes?"

Agree: 24

Neutral: 0

Disagree: 0

Question: "What do you think about the location of the nodes? Should any be added or removed?"

Too much planned for Atlantic south of San Antonio

If the "node" is at LB Blvd. and Artesia, what happens to ARCO, Jack in the Box, and the diesel station? Maybe a smaller node east and west of LB Blvd. & the 710?

I don't think that the entire strip of Atlantic from San Antonio to Wardlow is a "node" - From San Antonio – Bixby is the village center of Bixby Knolls.

Any plan to clean up N. Long Beach sounds good to me!



The neighborhood surrounding San Antonio and Orange will not support outdoor café's/restaurants.
Atlantic Ave – NO! Need street parking, left turn lane, signals – Ignores impact of Bixby Knolls shopping center on adjacent businesses – Ignores parking, access – trees.
DO NOT COPY Ocean & Pine!
I like the concept put – I need to know more about implementation
The type, quality and management is important to any node considered
The Bixby Knolls area located by Robert's, etc. is a real eyesore – what's the plan for that?
I don't think it's a good idea to have a node on Atlantic
They are appropriate
Node at San Antonio and Orange great idea

Question: "What types of shops & services would you like to see in the nodes? How can these nodes be improved?"

Beauty & barbershops, drug stores coffee shops, sandwich shops
Correct that inane curving of Atlantic north of Carson. It's a wonder they haven't had bad accidents! Ever try it in the fog?
Recreation activities, movies, bank, furniture stores, dry goods.
Good breakfast/lunch restaurants/café's – good dinner alternatives
More restaurant facilities – Yoshinoya, Baja Fresh – Thai restaurants
Nodes need to be evaluated on an individual basis
More parking – more retail area out center

Commercial Areas – Regional/Highway Oriented Nodes:

Question: "Do you agree with the location of these nodes?"

Agree: 27
 Neutral: 0
 Disagree: 2

Question: "What do you think about the location of the nodes? Should any be added or removed?"

Too much below Del Amo Blvd.
They must be easily accessible – Bixby Knolls shopping center is a good example (entrance access limited to speed traffic elsewhere)
Don't need any more
I definitely agree with quiet neighborhood events that bring people together at San Antonio & 46th – the area needs this.
Market & Cherry should be expanded to include south of Cherry

Question: "What types of shops & services would you like to see in the nodes? How can these nodes be improved?"

Steinmart or Barnes & Noble
Drug Store like Rite-Aid or Sav-on
Parking & small retail stores. Traffic signals designed for customers, not thru-traffic.
Pet Smart
Expand K-Mart, re-do the industrial north of south Cherry & do as a large center
Good architecture – sit down dinner – green & well-kept



Housing – Housing on Major Streets:

MATCH THE HOUSING TYPE TO THE STREET:

Long Beach Blvd North of the 710 fwy.

Housing type A (Single Family Detached Units)

Acceptable: 31

Unacceptable: 3

Housing type B (Townhouses & Duplex/Quadplex Units)

Acceptable: 7

Unacceptable: 15

Housing type C (Small Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 8

Unacceptable: 18

Housing type D (Medium Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 1

Unacceptable: 24

Comments:

Noise, Traffic must be mitigated

Design with character, pride, greenspace and trees, associations to maintain

No rentals – get rid of the bars – Include trees and landscapes – provide parking

Long Beach Blvd between Del Amo & the 710 fwy.

Housing type A (Single Family Detached Units)

Acceptable: 25

Unacceptable: 2

Housing type B (Townhouses & Duplex/Quadplex Units)

Acceptable: 7

Unacceptable: 11

Housing type C (Small Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 1

Unacceptable: 23

Housing type D (Medium Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 0

Unacceptable: 23

Comments:

No more rentals in this area

Owner Occupied (No more rentals!)

Need to keep density down

Parking & noise mitigation required

Should be light manufacturing?

Long Beach Blvd between Carson and Bixby

Housing type A (Single Family Detached Units)

Acceptable: 15

Unacceptable: 26

Comment

Tentatively unacceptable – Concerned about ability to ensure properties are consistent with surrounding area homes.

Housing type B (Townhouses & Duplex/Quadplex Units)

Acceptable: 11

Unacceptable: 31



Housing type C (Small Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 1

Unacceptable: 38

Housing type D (Medium Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 0

Unacceptable: 39

Comments

I do not believe that this is a residential area.

No! – Fix traffic controls

Irregular office bldg – need to create consistent, clean look – residential OK

Passable sit down restaurants – green spaces

NO residential of any kind – reuse as commercial

KB bldg. And E-tak buildings are inconsistent and could go

We need to protect and reuse other buildings with redevelopment help

Tentatively unacceptable – Concerned about ability to ensure properties are consistent with surrounding area homes.

Atlantic Avenue between Del Amo & Harding

Housing type A (Single Family Detached Units)

Acceptable: 25

Unacceptable: 5

Housing type B (Townhouses & Duplex/Quadplex Units)

Acceptable: 9

Unacceptable: 17

Housing type C (Small Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 0

Unacceptable: 23

Housing type D (Medium Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 1

Unacceptable: 24

Comments

Density & parking are major issues

Keep density down – develop better ideas in parking – maintain and create green space

Groups of housing should not be as small as the housing on Atlantic Ave.

Atlantic Avenue between Atlantic & Cherry

Housing type A (Single Family Detached Units)

Acceptable: 21

Unacceptable: 5

Housing type B (Townhouses & Duplex/Quadplex Units)

Acceptable: 8

Unacceptable: 16

Housing type C (Small Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 0

Unacceptable: 24

Housing type D (Medium Apartment & Condominium Buildings)

Acceptable: 1

Unacceptable: 24

Comments

This area should be kept commercial/industrial

Partner sit down restaurant and over-business houses & parking – create and keep green space



Housing – Housing on Other Streets:

Question: “Do you agree with the idea of creating consistent residential areas along these corridors?”

Agree: 29

Neutral: 0

Disagree: 1

Question: “What do you think of creating consistent residential areas along these corridors? What areas should be targeted?

No rentals (x5); No rentals – decreased density – good quality single-family housing

Senior Housing (x2)

Cherry Ave. – east side of street, stay commercial – won’t go residential

We “own” our business free & clear, we’re not young enough to start over.

Long Beach Blvd.

Include mixed use & mini-malls with parking – require 2 parking spaces per unit.

Those areas are perfect – Good Job – 1 Market, 2 South, 3 Cherry

More rentals

LB Blvd. N. of freeway

Single family home owners only – no multiple dwelling: duplex, condo’s, 4-plexes or apartments – open green space

A good idea, but may prove too expensive

Question: “Where do you think that some of the existing commercial establishments could be relocated to?”

Long Beach Blvd. / Market

Atlantic Ave – Bixby Knolls shopping center – must have off-street parking and access

Some can go away

South of the 405

Housing – Areas Of General Rehabilitation

Statement: “Selective removal of housing units should occur in some areas to create parks and open space.”

Agree: 26 / 1 Comment:

If housing units are apartments & other multi-family rentals

Neutral: 0

Disagree: 13

Statement: “Housing improvement programs in North Long Beach neighborhoods should be a major focus (instead of focusing on commercial corridors).”

Agree: 33

Neutral: 2

Disagree: 6

Statement: “I like the idea of converting rental units to owner-occupied units, where possible.”

Agree: 37

Neutral: 0

Disagree: 1

Community Facilities

Determining Priorities: “Put dots next to the top 3 types of community facilities that you feel are needed.”:

Schools: 19

Libraries: 24

Comment:

“One library in NLB with 80, 000 people?”

Parks: 23

Senior Housing: 21



Comments:

"Converting Andy Street is a great idea!"

"Single, 1-level senior housing in Central L.B."

"Andy St."

Community Centers: 17

Comments:

"Community Center on LB Blvd (San Antonio-Bixby)"

"Need Community Center near Atlantic/Bixby Rd."

Neighborhood / Community Police Centers: 16

Comment:

"We like the new police center in the ARCO Station over LB Blvd."

Indoor Recreation Center: 7

Fire Stations: 4

Other: 1

Question: "What other types of community facilities are needed?"

Schools, Parks, Rec. Facilities

Children need rec. centers with programs!

Skate park

Public swimming pool (x2)

Public swimming pool "not free – very important"

Child care

Art center – Bixby knolls

Shuttle bus service between schools, home and commercial areas

Good community meeting rooms – various size, 5-50 people

Senior center. (x4)

Children's clinic

Youth Center

Question: "What types of community facilities (if any) should be located in the "Village Center?"

Parking (x2)

Police Office

Community meeting, information building with combined community policing section within

Art center (x2) "Bixby knolls village – San Antonio, Bixby"

Copies, fax

Community meeting rooms

Question: "Do you think that open space in North Long Beach should be preserved where possible? What specific areas?

Yes, demolish bad hotels & apartments

Atlantic Ave. – San Antonio Dr. – N.E. Corner

North Division Police Station @ Dooley's, Freeway close is better than stealing open green space

Yes!

Yes – more needed and kept up

All should be preserved or expanded or new created

Yes, tear down apartments north of Artesia and build a park for the children in the area, The children are bored because there are no youth programs or parks so they continuously climb the fences of the schools and vandalize them. They also engage in drug & gang activity. Please Help!

Pocket Parks

Police Station at Dooley's

Yes – Myrtle & Artesia

Keep the sub-station at Sherer Park so it will be a safe place

Build new police station @ Dooleys – NOT Sherer park



Question: "What do you think of developing parks along the LA river? Would you use these parks?"

Yes! (x10)

Naturalize as much as possible by adding fill dirt on concrete waterways and planting trees – Yes

Neutral – Good equestrian arena

Good – ingress/egress is an issue

No

Yes! – we use all the time and they are NOT dangerous

We should make full use of area along river for parks – NOT TRUCKS.

Industrial Strategies

Statement: "To create consistent land uses and buffers, it is a good idea to convert residential or commercial areas and replace them with industrial areas."

Agree: 6

Neutral: 0

Disagree: 31

Question: "What do you think of the idea of converting residential or commercial areas and replacing them with industrial areas? Where should this occur?"

Don't like it at all

Improve existing – do not add more

We don't need it

Depends upon the area – Yes North of Artesia, East of Cherry and West of LA River

No (x3)

This should not happen – we already have too much of long beach covered in industrial centers

We need good housing – not "bad" light industrial

For consistency of use definitely

No, No, No!

None

Question: "What types of industrial development would you like to see in N. Long Beach."

None (x5)

Improve existing to beautify would-be area

Craft industries

Light Industrial (x2)

Only buildings emporium along trucks at south – retail has failed – also, existing areas are OK

N-O-N-E

No Industrial

See Utility corridor would be a good place for light industry

We need shopping – no more smog or fumes

Light, non-polluting only, create jobs



STATION 4: TARGET SITES

Comments on Target Sites

1. Village Center at South Street and Atlantic Avenue

South of Atlantic – key location to central community

No – not to current L.B. zoning – try Larchmont Village Plan

Need adequate parking lot – 2 story

The need is great as is the idea – will there be any control over type of businesses? We certainly don't want it to look like L.B.

Blvd (south of Market) – little Tijuana.

Where would you park? That's why people don't shop there now!! No parking spaces.

You would have to get a bigger parking lot for all of the visitors that would shop – no parking is the current problem

2. Market Street and Long Beach Blvd.

Says it all

Add more parking & historic theme

Good – parking & green space needed

Pine area for development. It would be easier at Atlantic. There is a lot of property available for development.

Yes, but please don't impede traffic from the 710 fwy.

Also consider LB Blvd. and Del Amo

No

Fix LB Blvd. all the way to our border – we are Long Beach too!

Take garage doors off of store fronts

3. Artesia Blvd. and Atlantic Ave.

Leave alone – ideal for fast food for students or travelers

Yes

4. K-Mart at Cherry and Market

No – change to industrial use

This is a prime target of revitalization as well as the entire Cherry stretch into Paramount – It's a major gateway into LB that needs beautification and re-designing. Get K-mart to pitch in \$. I agree with target site plan.

I used to shop there several times a week – since store expansion, the store looks like crap – haven't shopped there in years.

I go to Target in Bellflower instead.

Ugly now – needs to be improved to generate more retail activity – visual improvement green space

K-mart needs to invest to improve layout & display in the store

Crossing light would help

5. Former Builder's Emporium Site on South St.

Good plan – this area is an eyesore!

Yes!

Light industrial could work – retail has not – need good jobs

When Ralph's bought Food 4 Less they blocked the access from the west end of the store. The south access is too congested.

I don't shop there anymore.

No industry

This has been empty for years – a shopping center would be nice

Shopping center

We have enough industries.

6. Bixby Knolls Shopping Center (Atlantic & San Antonio)

Too much planned for Bixby area – that should be last - start with poor areas first

This failed because of City neglect – provide better vehicle access – let specialty shops develop

NO concerts – limited quiet outdoor festivals – find MAJOR, long-term tenants – no thrift stores

Farmers market – great! Bulldoze unused units build anew – open up front to back parking

Develop the Bixby Knolls (illegible) – better return on \$ spent

It would liven the place up a whole lot – but parking



Needs to be totally redone

Convert 3030 Atlantic to ground floor retail & parking structure to be shared by all businesses

I think our energies would be better spent improving the Bixby Knolls Village center (San Antonio-Bixby)

Demolish the vacant bldgs – to open up alternatives

7. Long Beach Blvd. Areas N. of the 710 Fwy.

Residential & green areas – the Diesel fuel station

Need medians to promote truck traffic

Single family housing

Low density residential – good

Excellent! – single family homes only

Leave alone for now!

Loarge major grocery store West of the freeway/river

Landscape medians!! – Slow truck traffic

Proper industrial housing

8. Artesia Blvd. Between Atlantic & Cherry Ave.

Traffic is too fast – develop off street parking and access to support existing and any new commercial development

Residential good

9. Long Beach Blvd. Between Carson & Bixby

Warning! Nimby

No!! Want to up-grade & reuse commercial - you have the tools

Several Bldg's are architecturally significant – reuse!

Bad planning to put in residential

East side – office development west side – leave alone - with better parking

Need consistent building not the current mish-mash that exists - too many vacant business many residential is what we need

Upscale senior housing needed

Strongly disagree – the area is already is over populated! Need to bring in new commercial business to support the existing community

10. Multi-Family Residential Area Near Artesia and Paramount

Housing needed for low-income families

North – industrial. Southside – single family

Impact on Schools?

